

**No. 22-15961**

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

---

DONALD J. TRUMP, AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION,  
RAFAEL BARBOSA, LINDA CUADROS, DOMINICK LATELLA,  
WAYNE ALLYN ROOT AND NAOMI WOLF,

*Plaintiffs-Appellants,*

v.

TWITTER, INC., AND JACK DORSEY,

*Defendants-Appellees.*

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Case No. 3-21-cv-08378-JD  
Hon. James Donato, United States District Judge

---

**APPELLANTS DONALD J. TRUMP, AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE  
UNION, RAFAEL BARBOSA, LINDA CUADROS, DOMINICK LATELLA,  
AND WAYNE ALLYN ROOT’S REPLY TO TWITTER’S RESPONSE TO  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE RESPONSE TO  
SUGGESTION OF MOOTNESS**

---

ANDREI D. POPOVICI  
MARIE L. FIALA  
LAW OFFICE OF ANDREI D. POPOVICI,  
P.C.  
2121 North California Blvd. Suite 290  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: (650) 530-9989  
Facsimile: (650) 530-9990  
Email: andrei@apatent.com  
Email: marie@apatent.com

---

*Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellants  
Donald J. Trump, the Forty-fifth  
President of the United States; American  
Conservative Union; Rafael Barbosa;  
Linda Cuadros; Dominick Latella; and  
Wayne Allyn Root*

[ADDITIONAL COUNSEL ON  
SIGNATURE PAGE]

Plaintiffs-Appellants Donald J. Trump, American Conservative Union, Rafael Barbosa, Linda Cuadros, Dominick Latella, and Wayne Allyn Root (“Plaintiffs”) filed a motion (Dkt. 71) (“Motion”) requesting an extension of the deadline for Plaintiffs’ submission of a Response to Defendant’s Suggestion of Mootness (Dkt. 65) until the ultimate deadline for Plaintiffs’ Reply Brief.

Defendant Twitter’s response to the Motion (Dkt. 73) stated that “Twitter does not oppose Appellants’ motion but requests that it also be granted an additional seven days to file its reply brief in support of its suggestion of mootness.”

Plaintiffs do not oppose Twitter’s request for an additional seven days to file its reply brief in support of its suggestion of mootness.

Dated: March 23, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICE OF ANDREI D. POPOVICI, P.C.

By: s/ Andrei D. Popovici  
Andrei D. Popovici

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants  
Donald J. Trump, American  
Conservative Union, Rafael Barbosa,  
Linda Cuadros, Dominick Latella,  
and Wayne Allyn Root*

JOHN P. COALE  
2901 Fessenden Street NW  
Washington, DC 20008  
Telephone: (202) 255-2096  
Email: johnpcoale@aol.com

RICHARD POLK LAWSON  
GARDNER BREWER HUDSON  
400 North Ashley Drive  
Suite 1100  
Tampa, FL 33602  
Telephone: (813) 221-9600  
Email: rlawson@gardnerbrewer.com

ALEX KOZINSKI  
719 Yarmouth Road Suite 101  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274  
Telephone: (310) 541-5885  
Email: alex@kozinski.com

FRANK C. DUDENHEFER, JR.  
THE DUDENHEFER LAW FIRM  
L.L.C.  
2721 Saint Charles Avenue, Suite 2A  
New Orleans, LA 70130  
Telephone: (504) 616-5226  
Email: fcdlaw@aol.com

JOHN Q. KELLY  
FERGUSON COHEN LLP  
25 Field Point Road  
Greenwich, CT 06830  
Tel: (203) 661-1197  
Email: jqkelly@fercolaw.com

MICHAEL J. JONES  
RYAN TOUGIAS  
IVEY BARNUM & O'MARA  
170 Mason Street  
Greenwich, CT 06830  
Telephone: (203) 661-6000  
Email: mjones@fercolaw.com

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**Certificate of Compliance**

**9th Cir. Case Number(s): No. 22-15961**

I am the attorney for Plaintiffs-Appellants Donald J. Trump, American Conservative Union, Rafael Barbosa, Linda Cuadros, Dominick Latella, and Wayne Allyn Root.

**This brief contains 113 words**, excluding the items exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f). The brief's type size and typeface comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and (6).

I certify that this brief (*select only one*):

☒ [X] complies with the word limit of Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2) and the page limit of Cir. R. 27-1(1).

☐ [ ] is a **cross-appeal** brief and complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 28.1-1.

☐ [ ] is an **amicus** brief and complies with the word limit of Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(5), Cir. R. 29-2(c)(2), or Cir. R. 29-2(c)(3).

☐ [ ] is for a **death penalty** case and complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 32-4.

☐ [ ] complies with the longer length limit permitted by Cir. R. 32-2(b) because (*select only one*):

☐ [ ] it is a joint brief submitted by separately represented parties;

☐ [ ] a party or parties are filing a single brief in response to multiple briefs; or

☐ [ ] a party or parties are filing a single brief in response to a longer joint brief.

☐ [ ] complies with the length limit designated by court order dated \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ [ ] is accompanied by a motion to file a longer brief pursuant to Cir. R. 32-2(a).

**Signature:** *s/ Andrei D. Popovici*

**Date:** March 23, 2023